



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,773	11/14/2001	Todres Yampel	030/3	5811

27538 7590 01/24/2006

KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER L.L.P.
900 ROUTE 9 NORTH
WOODBIDGE, NJ 07095

EXAMINER

MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/992,773	Applicant(s) YAMPEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Sajeda Muhebbullah	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to RCE filed 01/09/2006.
2. Claims 1-6 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 4 are independent claims. In Amendment, claims 1 and 4 have been amended. This action is made Non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callaway et al. ("Callaway", US 5,043,919) in view of Schauser (US 6,331,855).

As per claim 1, Callaway teaches a system comprising a remote computer and a plurality of user terminals, a method of updating the display at a user terminal comprising the following steps (col.1, lines 14-39):

receiving a screen of information transmitted (col.1, lines 16-17);

dividing the screen into a plurality of objects, wherein each object has less information content than said screen of information (col.5, lines 11-21);

detecting which of the objects are affected by input from a user (col.5, lines 24-26);

sending information regarding the user input to the remote computer (col.5, lines 46-49);

receiving a new screen of information (col.5, lines 46-49);

based on the divided screen according to the dividing step, comparing only the affected objects in the new screen and the old screen (col.4, lines 45-55); and

Art Unit: 2174

updating said new screen by changing only portion(s) associated with the affected objects whereby in updating only the affected objects of a screen that has been previously divided, a more efficient screen update is achieved (col.1, lines 30-39, col.5, lines 5-13).

Callaway does not teach the steps to be carried out at the user terminal and receiving the screen of information from the remote computer. Schauser teaches the updating of display information in which the detection and updating of the screens can be performed at the user terminal or the remote computer (col.3, lines 57-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Schauser's teaching with Callaway's system in order to give more control to the user terminal and less work to be done by the host.

As per claim 2, Callaway teaches said objects to comprise fields into which data is to be entered by a user (col.5, lines 19-21, 46-49).

As per claim 3, Callaway teaches said objects to comprise character positions into which data is to be entered by a user (col.5, lines 19-21, 46-49).

The limitations of independent claim 4 are similar in scope to the limitations of independent claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale. In addition, Callaway teaches recreating only the changes in the affected objects in the user display (col.5, lines 46-49).

Claims 5-6 are similar in scope to claims 2-3 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 01/09/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2174

Applicant argued the following:

a) Callaway and Schauser does not teach a pre-subdivided screen by a user terminal into objects and updating only affected objects.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

a) Callaway does clearly teach the division of the screen (col.5, lines 10-13) wherein only the affected objects are updated (col.1, lines 36-39).

Communications

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4065. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday and alt. Mondays from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100